

SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Claims 1-23 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,127, 524 to Renda (“Renda”).

With respect to independent claim 1 as amended herein, Applicants respectfully submit that Renda fails to disclose each and every element “in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” M.P.E.P § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*). Independent claim 1 as amended herein recites:

A method comprising:

intercepting a request from a user for a web page, **the user connected to a blocked port** of a packet forwarding device, **the blocked port preventing the user from accessing a network** coupled to the forwarding device;
directing the user to a network login page;
authenticating the user; and
allowing the user to access the network when the user is authenticated.

Renda does not disclose “the user **connected to a blocked port** ... the blocked port preventing the user from accessing a network” as Applicants recite in claim 1. As pointed out by the PTO, Renda does disclose: “A system [that] intercepts communications [and] determines whether a user of the **device having that MAC address has permission to access ...**.” Refer to Renda col. 3, ln. 60-68. This passage however, makes no reference whatsoever to “ports” or

“blocked ports,” but rather seems to suggest that the user’s MAC address is used to prevent access to a network, rather than “the blocked port preventing the user from accessing a network,” as Applicants recite.

Because Renda fails to disclose each and every element in claim 1 as amended herein, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Independent claim 18 recites a similar limitation to that of claim 1, and therefore is also in condition for allowance. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-17, 19, and 21-23 necessarily contain the limitations of the independent claims upon which they depend, as well as adding limitations of their own, and therefore are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the PTO withdraw its rejection to claims 1-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

No new matter added:

Applicants respectfully submit that the inclusion of the phrase “blocked port” into amended claims 1, 17-18, and 21 is not new matter. Support for said amendment may be found in original claim 20 canceled herein, also in figure 3 (showing port states 207-208, and “unblock port” 122), and in ¶ [0033] of the specification.

CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.


Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: January 18, 2007



Gregory D. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,926

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073